

REMARKS

By this amendment, claim 41 is cancelled and claims 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 34, 35, 38, 39 and 40 are amended. Claims 1-25, 28 and 33 have been previously cancelled. Accordingly, claims 26, 27, 29-32 and 34-40 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 26, 31, 35 and 39 are independent claims. The Office Action indicates that claim 41 is objected to but would be allowable if presented in independent form.

In view of the above amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending objections and rejections for the reasons discussed below.

DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 35-40 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 2 of U. S. Patent No. 6,788,356 in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,128,786 issued to Yanagisawa ("Yanagisawa"). This rejection is respectfully traversed because, in this response, to obviate the double patenting rejection, Applicants timely file a Terminal Disclaimer attached hereafter.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 35-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent No. 6,297,862 issued to Murade ("Murade"). This rejection is respectfully traversed at least for the following reasons.

With respect to claims 35-38, independent claim 35 has been amended to recite "a conductive pattern *separated from the gate line* and covering a gap between the disconnected portions of the black matrix". An example of this claimed feature is shown in Figs. 1 and 2 of the present application, in which the buffer layer 28 is separated from the gate lines 22 and covering the gap between the disconnected portions of the black matrix 92 and 94.

In this regard, the Examiner asserted that, in Murade, the gate extension 2F corresponds to the claimed buffer layer. However, the gate extension 2F is extended from the gate line 2. Since the gate extension 2F is not separated from the gate line 2, Murade fails to disclose "a conductive pattern *separated from the gate line* and covering a gap between the disconnected portions of the black matrix" as recited in claim 35.

For this reason, it is submitted that claim 35 is patentably distinct over Murade. Claims 36-38 are dependent from claim 35 and hence would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

With respect to claims 39 and 40, independent claim 39 has been also amended to recite "forming a conductive pattern *separated from the gate line* and covering a gap between the disconnected portions of the black matrix layer". As mentioned above, Murade fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature. Thus, it is submitted that claim

39 is patentable over Murade. Claim 40 is dependent from claim 39 and hence would be also patentably distinct at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 35-40.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 26, 27 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 5,926,235 issued to Han, *et al.* ("Han") in view of U. S. Patent No. 5,128,786 issued to Yanagisawa, *et al.* ("Yanagisawa"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 26 recites "a *conductive* pattern separated from the gate lines and covering a gap between the disconnected portions of the black matrix". Regarding this claimed feature, the Examiner stated "Yanagisawa does disclose an alignment film [18] on top of its surface ... This layer would be a buffer layer covering a gap between disconnected portions of the black matrix [the alignment layer covers the entire substrate, including the gap]." (Office Action, page 6)

However, the alignment film 18 is *not conductive*. In fact, since the alignment film 18 fills the gap between the electrodes 14, the alignment film 18 should be non-conductive to render the display device operable. Thus, Yanagisawa fails to disclose or suggest "a *conductive* pattern ... covering a gap between the disconnected portions of the black matrix".

For this reason, it is submitted that claim 26 is patentable over the cited references. Claims 27 and 29 are dependent from claim 26 and hence would be also

patentable at least for the same reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 26, 27 and 29.

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Han in view of Yanagisawa and further in view of Murade. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 30 is dependent from claim 26. As previously mentioned, claim 26 has been amended and is now believed to be patentable over Han and Yanagisawa because, for example, they fail to disclose or suggest “a conductive pattern *separated from the gate lines* and covering a gap between the disconnected portions of the black matrix”, as recited in claim 26.

As mentioned above, in Murade, the gate extension 2F is extended from the gate line 2 and hence is not separated from the gate line 2. Thus, Murade fails to disclose “a conductive pattern *separated from the gate lines* and covering a gap between the disconnected portions of the black matrix”.

Since the cited references fail to disclose or suggest this claimed feature, it is submitted that claim 26 is patentable over Han, Yanagisawa and Murade. Claim 30 is dependent from claim 26 and hence would be also patentable at least for the same reason. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 30.

Claims 31 and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Han in view of Yanagisawa and further in view of U.S. Patent No.

5,956,103 issued to Ishiguro ("Ishiguro"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claim 31 recites "forming a conductive pattern separated from the gate lines covering a gap between the disconnected portions of the black matrix". As previously mentioned, Han and Yanagisawa fail to disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Ishiguro discloses, in Fig. 2A, the conductive light-shielding film 2 formed below the data signal line 12. However, Ishiguro fails to disclose or suggest "forming a conductive pattern separated from the gate lines covering a gap between the disconnected portions of the black matrix."

Since the cited references fail to disclose or suggest this claimed feature, it is submitted that claim 31 is patentable over the cited references. Claim 32 is dependent from claim 31 and would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 31 and 32.

Claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han in view of Yanagisawa, and Ishiguro, and further in view of Murade. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 34 is dependent from claim 31. As previously mentioned, claim 31 has been amended and is now believed to be patentable over Han, Yanagisawa and Ishiguro because they fail to disclose or suggest "forming a conductive pattern

separated from the gate lines covering a gap between the disconnected portions of the black matrix.”

As, as previously mentioned, Murade fails to disclose or suggest this claimed feature. Since none of the cited references discloses or suggests this claimed feature, it is submitted that claim 31 is patentable over them. Claim 34 is dependent from claim 31 and would be also patentable at least for the same reason.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claim 34.

OTHER MATTERS

In this response, claim 41 has been cancelled because it appears to be inconsistent with the description “The connection pattern connects the gate lines to the buffer conductive layers through the second contact holes” at page 4, lines 13 and 14 of the specification.

Also, in addition to the amendments mentioned above, claims are amended for better wording and clarification.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard T. Schachner, Reg. No. 48,342, FOR
Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: June 15, 2005

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:WSC/tmk

ATTACHMENT: TERMINAL DISCLAIMER

\\COM\508337.1